REMARKS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-43 are pending.

The Office Action maintains from the previous Office Action rejection of claims 1-25, 27-32, 34-39 and 41-43 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Straub (US Patent No. 6,216,141) in view of Nawaz (US Patent No. 5,959,621) and in view of Smythe (US Patent No. 6,418,214).

The Office Action maintains from the previous Office Action rejection of claims 26, 33 and 40 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Straub, Nawaz, Smythe, and Kisiel (US Patent No. 6,327,586).

According to the foregoing, the claims are amended, and, thus the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added. The rejections are traversed.

SPECIFICATION OBJECTION

The specification is objected to by requiring a cross-reference to application PCT/JP99/005202 and JP 10-271952 under 37 CFR 1.78. The present Application is a 35 USC 371 (national stage) application of PCT/JP99/005202. According to the foregoing the specification is amended. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

DRAWINGS

The Office Action mailed April 6, 2007 objected to and required corrected drawings for FIGS. 4-9. Accordingly, two (2) replacement drawings sheets for FIGS. 4-9 are submitted as attached hereto. Withdrawal of the drawing objection is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

The independent claims are 1, 12, 19, 23, 30 and 37.

In contrast to Straub, Nawaz and Smythe, the claimed embodiments, using claims 1, 12 and 19, as examples, provide " ... upon a user selectsselection of the image data from the moving display area, and the display means stocks the selected image data from the moving display area on a display area by displaying the selected image data from the moving display area on a user selected stationary display area separate from the moving display area ... the

image data on the moving display area, the stocked image data on the user selected stationary display area, and said source data are simultaneously displayed without overlapping each other" (e.g., independent claim 1). For example, the present Application page 14, line 13 to page 15, line 20 and FIG. 3, static display oriented bitmap data (stocked image data) 14 and ticker moving display area 10, and page 19, lines 15-24, and FIG. 10 (moving display area 10, stocked image data 14, and source data of stocked image data 15) support the claim amendments.

The Office Action alleges the claimed embodiments are obvious based upon Straub's FIG. 6, which discusses a browser 170 when the user click on the teaser 142 displayed in FIG. 5, and Nawaz' FIG. 3 ticker display pane 142, and Smythe's opening of a new window when a link is selected.. The Office Action Response to Arguments also alleges Straub's FIG. 5, summary image data 142 is similar to the claimed "... upon a user selectsselection of the image data from the moving display area, and the display means stocks the selected image data from the moving display area on a display area by displaying the selected image data from the moving display area on a user selected stationary display area separate from the moving display area ... the image data on the moving display area, the stocked image data on the user selected stationary display area, and said source data are simultaneously displayed without overlapping each other."

However, a prima facie case of obviousness over Straub, Nawaz and Smythe cannot be established, because Straub, Nawaz and Smythe fail to disclose, either expressly or implicitly, the claimed embodiments as follows. Straub and Smythe do not expressly discuss "*stocks the selected image data from the moving display area*," because Straub and Smythe do not provide a moving display area. Further, Nawaz does not expressly discuss "*stocks the selected image data from the moving display area*," because Nawaz discusses that upon selecting a data item 152 in the ticker display pane 142, documents related to the data item are retrieved in a browser window 108, which differs from the claimed embodiment of "stock[ing]" the selected moving image data.

Further, Straub, Nawaz and Smythe fail to implicitly disclose the claimed embodiments, because even if one combined Straub, Nawaz and Smythe, the combined system would include Nawaz' ticker display pane 142 in Straub's FIG. 5 viewer 140 and upon selecting a data item in Nawaz's ticker display pane 142, a new window would be opened to show retrieved content. However, there is no evidence in Straub, Nawaz or Smythe, or in knowledge of one skilled in the art, to motivate modifying Nawaz's ticker display pane 142 to provide the claimed "... *upon a*

user selectsselection of the image data from the moving display area, and the display means *stocks the selected image data from the moving display area on a display area by displaying the selected image data from the moving display area on a user selected stationary display area separate from the moving display area ... the image data on the moving display area, the stocked image data on the user selected stationary display area, and said source data are simultaneously displayed without overlapping each other"* and seen the benefit of allowing the user to easily confirm the content of the source data rather than attempt to comprehend and select image data from a moving display area.

In other words, when a data item is selected in Nawaz' ticker display pane 142, a browsing window 108 displays retrieved content of the selected data item, which differs from the claimed "*stocks the selected image data from the moving display area on a display area by displaying the selected image data from the moving display area on a user selected stationary display area separate from the moving display area.*"

Further, contrary to the Office Action Response to Arguments, Straub's FIG. 6, browser 170, which is displayed by selecting the teaser 142 in FIG. 5, differs from the claimed stocking of an image data from a moving display area by "*displaying the selected image data from the moving display area on a user selected stationary display area separate from the moving display area ...*[and] *the image data on the moving display area, the stocked image data on the user selected stationary display area, and said source data are simultaneously displayed without overlapping each other.*"

Further, Straub's displaying of the selected teaser 152, 154 in the browser 170 differs from the claimed "*the image data on the moving display area, the stocked image data on the user selected stationary display area, and said source data are simultaneously displayed without overlapping each other,*" (FIG. 10) because the teaser 152 and 154 were not selected from a moving display area, and the selected teasers 152, 154 are not displayed "*simultaneously displayed without overlapping each other.*" Further, Smythe only discusses opening a new window when a link is selected.

Further, in contrast to Straub, Nawaz and Smythe, the embodiment of claims 23, 30 and 37, using claim 23 as an example, provide:

> displaying plural pieces of information in a manner of
> sequentially changing a display content on a moving display area
> on the display, as displayed moving information,

detecting a predetermined user operation for the <u>displayed moving</u> information~~displayed~~,

recording the detected user operation for the displayed _moving information_ in the moving display area, in a user selected stationary display area separate from the moving display area,

when the recorded user operation on the stationary display area separate from the moving display area is designated, displaying linked information corresponding to the displayed information for which the user operation is detected, on a display area separate from the moving display area and the user selected stationary display area, and

simultaneously <u>without overlapping</u> displaying the plural pieces of information on the moving display area<u> as the displayed moving information</u>, the recorded user operation on the user selected stationary display area, and said linked information.

Straub, Nawaz and Smythe fails to expressly or implicitly disclose "**recording the detected user operation for the displayed <u>moving</u> information ... [and] simultaneously <u>without overlapping</u> displaying the plural pieces of information on the moving display area<u> as the displayed moving information</u>, the recorded user operation on the user selected stationary display area, and said linked information.**"

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Dependent claims recite patentably distinguishing features of their own or are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from the independent claims.

The Office Action Response to Arguments relies upon Straub column 8, lines 25-35 and column 2, lines 7-20 and alleges that Straub's image dimensions are same as the claimed "wherein **the stocked image data is formatted to indicate an attribute of the source data** to which the stocked image data is linked" (e.g., dependent claim 2). However, Straub FIG. 5 and column 8, lines 35-44 discuss displaying a teaser 142 in viewer 140, which fails disclose, either expressly, or implicitly to one skilled in the art to modify Straub to format the teaser 140 to indicate an attribute of the content of the teaser 140. Further, a dimension of teaser 140 might be an attribute of the teaser image 140, but would not indicate an attribute of retrieved content related to the teaser image 140. In other words, Straub is silent on whether a smaller teaser image 140 would indicate a small amount of retrieved content related to the teaser image 140.

16

For example, in contrast to Straub, Nawaz and Smythe, dependent claim 2 provides "wherein *the stocked image data is formatted to indicate an attribute of the source data* to which the stocked image data is linked."

For example, in contrast to Straub, Nawaz and Smythe, dependent claim 4 provides wherein *the stocked image data is formatted by displaying a window, provided along a periphery of the background image, for indicating an attribute of the source data* to which the stocked image data is linked."

See, for example, dependent claim 5, "wherein said display means displays the stocked image data together with the window, of which a frame size differs corresponding to a capacity of the source data to which the stocked image data is linked."

See also dependent claim 7, "wherein said display means displays the stocked image data together with the window of which a frame configuration differs corresponding to a number of hours or days since a time when the source data to which the stocked image data is linked was acquired." In rejecting dependent claim 7, the Office Action alleges inherency based upon Straub's column 13, lines 43-49, which discusses displaying multiple documents from a single content provider. Straub discusses display a first document for a period of time and then a second document from the same content provider is displayed. However, Straub does not necessarily differentiate between a first and second document for different time periods based upon the claimed "*a frame configuration differs corresponding to a number of hours or days since a time when the source data to which the stocked image data is linked was acquired.*"

For example, the present application page 16, line 4 to page 18, line 4; FIGS. 4-9; and page 20, lines 1-6 supports dependent claims 2 and 4.

In view of the claim amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims and allowance of claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 6, 2007

By: / Mehdi D. Sheikerz /
    Mehdi D. Sheikerz
    Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501